UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,645	01/22/2001	John J. Donahue	11684.00005	6860

7590   09/01/2004

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER
GRAYSAY, TAMARA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/765,645	DONAHUE, JOHN J.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tamara L. Graysay	3623	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 January 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *see cont sheet*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

IDS Mail Dates: 06 April 2001, 13 April 2001, 14 March 2003, and 26 June 2003.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1.   The list of prior art attached to the Information Disclosure Statement, filed 26 June 2003,

has been initialed as being considered by the examiner. However, the examiner notes that the

International Search Report filed with the Information Disclosure Statement on 26 June 2003,

refers to an applicant's file reference *and* an international application number that appear to be

inconsistent with information provided in the instant application.

Drawings

2.   The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every

feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "telephone" as recited in claim 29

must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to

the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing

sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet,

even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing

should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure

must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must

be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the

drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the

renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement

Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the

drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified

and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the

drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because

reference character "1007" has been used to designate both the OBTAIN SUMMARY

DOCUMENTS step (Fig.10) and the TENANT MOVES IN step (Fig.10).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to

the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing

sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet,

even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled

"Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion

of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be

notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection

to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they

include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: M^2 (Fig.3); 608

(Fig.6); 907 (Fig.9); 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, and 1007 (Fig.10); and, 2103, 2104,

2105, 2106, 2107, and 2108 (Fig.21).

Although reference character(s) 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, and 607 are mentioned in the

description, the description is inconsistent with that shown in Fig.6. Namely, steps 602-607 are

described as being similar to steps 502-507 (Fig.5), but steps 502-507 as described in the

specification and depicted in Fig.5 are different from steps 602-607 depicted in Fig.6.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the

specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR

1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any

amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate

prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s)

should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to

obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office

action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5.   The drawings are objected to because the term M^2 used in Fig.3 is not described in the

specification and is unclear as to what that term represents.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to

the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing

sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet,

even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing

should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure

must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must

be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the

drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the

renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement

Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the

drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified

and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the

drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

6.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

a.   P.8, L.25, P.18, L.12, P.23, L.26, "Fig. 11" should be --Fig. 11A-11C--.

b.   P.21, L.9, "3" should be --14--.

c.   The acronym LHI should be defined in the specification by including the

acronym, usually in parenthesis, after the first occurrence of the term that is abbreviated.

Moreover, the specification and drawings raise concern as to the use of the acronym LHI

because the description of Figure 6 (step 604) defines LHI as leasehold improvement

(P.24, L.24) and the description of Figure 9 (step 902) defines LHI as leasehold

investment (P.25, L.23). The acronym(s) LHI must be related to each other with the

same definition or distinguished from each other using a prime or other character

designation.

d.   The description of steps 502 and 503 at P.24, L.2-5, is inconsistent with the steps

depicted in Fig.5. Also, the examiner notes that P.24, L.7, step 503 is not consistent with

step 503 as depicted in Fig.5. Moreover, the inconsistency is perpetuated as to Fig.6,

P.24, L.24-26, which refers back to the description of Fig.5.

e.   The term M^2 that is used in Fig.3, should be defined in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

7.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the

claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the

following is required: the term "telephone" as recited in claim 29, lacks proper antecedent basis in the specification.

8.   The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code in the form of underlined URLs at the bottom of page 1. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9.   Claims 8-10 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8, line 2, the term "the outsider" lacks clear antecedent basis. Although claim 7 recites the step of an outsider ... reviewing the project summary report, claim 8 is written as dependent upon claim 5, which does not provide clear antecedent basis for the term used in this claim. For this Office action, *claim 8 has been treated as though it depends upon claim 7.*

Claim 9, line 2, and claim 10, lines 2-3, "the project summary report" is confusing because there are two project summary reports recited in antecedent: the user completed project summary report of claim 6 and the reviewer revised project summary report of claim 7. For this Office action, *the project summary report that is stored, as recited in*

claims 9 and 10, has been interpreted to be the revised or latest revision of the project

summary report.

Claim 10, lines 1-2, the term "the at least one transmitted revision" lacks clear

antecedent basis. Although claim 8 recites the step of transmitting at least one revision,

claim 10 is written as dependent upon claim 6, which does not provide clear antecedent

basis for the term used in this claim. For this Office action, *claim 10 has been treated as*

though it depends upon claim 8.

Claim 27, line 2, the term "the LSP questionnaire" lacks clear antecedent basis in

the claim. For this Office action, *it has been treated as any information that is input to*

the computer and related to a particular local service provider.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis

for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10.   Claims 1-5, 11-13, 16-18, 21-24, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Raveis Jr. (US-6321202).

The term real estate transaction as recited in the claims has been broadly interpreted to

include any dealing associated with real estate, including pre-closing, closing, and post-

closing transactions related to a property.

Regarding claim 1, Raveis Jr. discloses a method of generating a report for a real estate transaction, comprising the steps:

- receiving over a computer network from one or more parties to the completed real estate transaction information relating to the completed real estate transaction;

  Raveis Jr. discloses a method of receiving data over a computer network at Fig.1, Ref.22, Fig.10, Ref.200; and users at Fig.1, Ref.18(1)-18(n) including vendors, contacts, sales agents, administrative personnel, e.g., C.5, L.8-10, who receive data related to a real estate transaction, e.g., C.4, L.26-34.

- generating a transaction report based on the received information;

  Raveis Jr. discloses generating various reports including financial and sale reports at C.13, L.60-63 that are based on data related to the real estate transaction.

- storing the transaction report in a computer storage device; and

  Raveis Jr. discloses a memory (Ref.60, 62) that is used to store databases (Ref.79, 89) that include the reports and information received for the real estate transaction.

- in response to a query by a third-party user, transmitting the transaction report over the computer network to the third-party user.

  Raveis Jr. discloses accessing data (see abstract) by a third-party user and transmitting the transaction by a display (Fig.9, Ref.900; C.10, L.40-63) depicting the report over the computer network (Fig.1, etc.) via remote access software described at C.6, L.10.

Regarding claim 2, Raveis Jr. discloses receiving a transaction questionnaire (report template C.6, L.25-28; form templates C.6, L.31-34) including information evaluating the real estate transaction and identifying at least one local service provider (e.g., real estate related goods and services C.12, L.9-11).

Regarding claims 3 and 4, at C.12, L.15-19, Raveis Jr. discloses an example of a gutter cleaner as the local service provider, as recited in claim 3, or another party to the real estate transaction, as recited in claim 4. The method of Raveis Jr. includes receiving an evaluation questionnaire, as broadly recited, including evaluation of the local service provider or another party to the real estate transaction (what vendor performed the gutter cleaning service and when the service was performed C.12, L.9-11 and 14-15), and transmitting the evaluation, as broadly recited, of the local service provider (e.g., maintenance reminders communicated to contacts C.12, L.11-14 and 15-22) to a third-party user (real estate consultant C.12, L.20-22).

Regarding claim 5, Raveis Jr. discloses an example of local challenges (house painting, faucet repair, and shrub planting C.12, L.29-36) encountered during the real estate transaction, as broadly recited.

Regarding claim 11, Raveis Jr. discloses receiving a comment report (e.g., data related to vendors C.13, L.46-48); storing the report (vendor database Ref.79, 89); and linking the report to the transaction report (accessing vendor data based on a particular phase of the real estate transaction at the abstract; relational arrangement between databases C.7, L.20-27).

Regarding claim 12, Raveis Jr. discloses storing plural transaction reports (managing real estate transactions, meaning more than one transaction C.10, L.65; tables relating to contacts, listings, surveys, system tables C.7, L. 1-19).

Regarding claim 13, Raveis Jr. discloses receiving user input criteria (type of report, e.g., financial reports, sales reports, etc. C.7, L.1-19) and transmitting at least one transaction report meeting the user criteria (creating reports such as sale reports, contact reports, e.g., C.13, L.60-63).

Regarding claim 16, Raveis Jr. discloses a system for generating a report for a real estate transaction, comprising:

(1) a computer programmed with software that generates at least one display (display Fig.9, Ref.900; C.10, L.40-63; report template C.6, L.25-34) to receive information related to a real estate transaction; generates a transaction report (e.g., create report C.13, L.60-63) based on the received information (data); and transmits the transaction report over the computer network to the third-party user (remote access software C.6, L.10); and

(2) a database (store databases Ref.79, 89) that stores the transaction report.

The examiner notes that claim 16, and the claims that depend upon claim 16, have been interpreted as system claims in which the software is further programmed to perform the recited functions, not as method or process claims.

Regarding claim 17, Raveis Jr. discloses software further programmed to display a transaction questionnaire (report template C.6, L.25-28; form templates C.6, L.31-34)

that facilitates receipt of information evaluating the real estate transaction and to identify

at least one local service provider (e.g., real estate related goods and services C.12, L.9-

11).

Regarding claim 18, Raveis Jr. discloses software that displays an evaluation

questionnaire (what vendor performed the gutter cleaning service and when the service

was performed C.12, L.9-11 and 14-15) that facilitates receipt of information evaluating

the service provider (e.g., real estate related goods and services C.12, L.9-11).

Regarding claims 21 and 22, Raveis Jr. disclose software further programmed to

receive a comment report including at least one comment related to the transaction report

(e.g., data related to vendors C.13, L.46-48), to store the report (vendor database), and to

link the report to the transaction report (accessing vendor data based on a particular phase

of the real estate transaction at the abstract; relational arrangement between databases

C.7, L.20-27). Raveis Jr. discloses that data about the vendors associated with a real

estate transaction is received and stored (e.g., abstract). Raveis Jr. also discloses that the

data is accessed during certain phases of the real estate transaction (e.g., abstract).

Regarding claim 23, Raveis Jr. discloses software further programmed to store

plural transaction reports (managing real estate transactions, meaning more than one

transaction C.10, L.65; tables relating to contacts, listings, surveys, system tables C.7, L.

1-19).

Regarding claim 24, Raveis Jr. discloses software further programmed to receive

user input criteria (type of report, e.g., financial reports, sales reports, etc.) and to

transmit (display Fig.9, Ref.900; C.10, L.40-63) at least one transaction report meeting

the user criteria (sales reports, contact reports, e.g., C.13, L.63).

Regarding claim 28, a "computer-readable medium" is inherent in a computer that

is capable of performing the recited steps. Raveis Jr. discloses a computer capable of

performing the steps of:

- receiving in the computer from one or more parties to the completed real estate

  transaction information relating to the completed real estate transaction;

  Raveis Jr. discloses a medium capable of receiving data (e.g., C.4, L.26-34)

  related to real estate transactions. The data is capable of being received over a

  computer network at Fig.1, Ref.22, Fig.10, Ref.200; from users depicted at Fig.1,

  Ref.18(1)-18(n) including vendors, contacts, sales agents, administrative

  personnel, e.g., C.5, L.8-10.

- generating a transaction report based on the received information;

  Raveis Jr. discloses a system capable of generating various reports including

  financial and sale reports at C.13, L.60-63 that are based on data related to the real

  estate transaction.

- storing the transaction report (memory Ref.60, 62) in a computer storage device (store

  databases Ref.79, 89); and

  Raveis Jr. discloses a memory (Ref.60, 62) that is capable of storing databases

  (Ref.79, 89) that include the reports and information received for the real estate

  transaction.

- in response to a query (e.g., accessing data at the abstract) by a third-party user,

   transmitting (display Fig.9, Ref.900; C.10, L.40-63) the transaction report over the

   computer network to the third-party user (remote access software C.6, L.10).

   Raveis Jr. discloses a system capable of accessing data (see abstract) by a third-

   party user and capable of transmitting the transaction by a display (Fig.9, Ref.900;

   C.10, L.40-63) depicting the report over the computer network (Fig.1, etc.) via

   remote access software described at C.6, L.10.

   Regarding claim 29, Raveis Jr. discloses using a telephone to perform the

receiving step (e.g., tele-communications C.12, L.44-46).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 6, 14, 19, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Raveis Jr. (US-6321202) in view of D'Alessandro (US-6556974).

   Regarding claim 6, Raveis Jr. lacks the method steps of determining required

fields, when not received prompting user input, and when received prompting completion

of the project summary report including a description of required tasks to complete the

real estate transaction. D'Alessandro teaches a method that ensures that a respondent

completes a questionnaire in order to analyze the questionnaires after all are completed.

The method of D'Alessandro includes determining required fields (DTMF input Fig.4,

Ref.330); prompting user input (play pre-recorded questions Fig.4, Ref.320); and prompting completion of the project summary report (no response replay loop Fig.4, Ref.340 and analysis Fig.4, Ref.140). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Raveis Jr. to include the steps of determining required fields, prompting a user, and prompting completion of a report for analysis, such as suggested by D'Alessandro, in order to ensure that a respondent has completed a particular questionnaire related to the real estate transaction.

Regarding claim 14, Raveis Jr. lacks the step of transmitting a local service provider summary report when a plurality of transaction reports are stored. D'Alessandro teaches a summary report or scorecard used to analyze an organization, or local service provider, when a plurality of transaction reports are stored for an organization or local service provider that is being evaluated. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Raveis Jr. to include the steps of transmitting a local service provider summary report when a plurality of transaction reports are stored, such as taught by D'Alessandro, in order to analyze the evaluation information for real estate transaction services provided by a local service provider.

Regarding claim 19, as noted with regard to claim 16 above, the examiner has not treated the claim as a method of using the system of claim 16, but rather as a system claim in which the software is further programmed to perform the recited functions. Raveis Jr. lacks software programmed to determine required fields; when not received

programmed to prompt user input; when received programmed to prompt completion of

the project summary report including description of required tasks to complete the real

estate transaction. D'Alessandro teaches computer software that is programmed to

ensure that a respondent completes a questionnaire and allows analysis of the

questionnaires after all are completed. The system of D'Alessandro includes software

programmed to determine required fields (DTMF input Fig.4, Ref.330); to prompt user

input (play pre-recorded questions Fig.4, Ref.320); and, to prompt completion of the

project summary report (no response replay loop Fig.4, Ref.340 and analysis Fig.4,

Ref.140). It would have been obvious to modify the system of Raveis Jr. to include

software programmed to determine required fields, to prompt a user, and to prompt

completion of a report for analysis, such as suggested by D'Alessandro, in order to ensure

that a respondent has completed a particular questionnaire related to the real estate

transaction and to analyze the summary information provided by the respondents.

Regarding claim 25, Raveis Jr. lacks the software programmed to determine

whether the user is a local service provider and to transmit a local service provider

summary report when a plurality of transaction reports are stored. D'Alessandro teaches

a summary report (scorecard) used to analyze a local service provider (organization)

when a plurality of transaction reports are stored for a local service provider

(organization) that is being evaluated (e.g., C.9, L.36-52). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of

Raveis Jr. to include software programmed to transmit a local service provider summary

report when a plurality of transaction reports are stored, such as taught by D'Alessandro,

in order to analyze the evaluation information for real estate transaction services provided

by a local service provider.

12.   Claims 7-10, 15, 20 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Raveis Jr. (US-6321202) and D'Alessandro (US-6556974) as applied to claim 6 above, and

further in view of PMBOK Guide (book, A guide to the project management body of

knowledge).

As noted in paragraph 9 above, claim 8 has been treated as though it is dependent upon

claim 7; and, claim 10 has been treated as though it is dependent upon claim 8.

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Raveis Jr., as modified by D'Alessandro, lacks the step

of an outsider reviewing the project summary report and transmitting at least one revision

to the party completing the project summary report. PMBOK Guide discloses project

management techniques. Namely, chapter 8, project quality management, discloses the

method of using a review and revise loop as a quality planning tool example (section

8.1.2 and Fig.8-3). Further, chapter 8 discloses that quality assurance should be

performed throughout a project and the quality planning tools are often used as part of

quality assurance (P.88). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Raveis Jr. and D'Alessandro to include the

step of an outsider revising the project summary report and transmitting the revision to

the party completing the project summary report, such as taught by PMBOK Guide, in

order to assure that the quality of the project summary report is satisfactory.

Regarding claims 9 and 20, Raveis Jr. as modified by D'Alessandro, includes

linking one report to another report (accessing vendor data based on a particular phase of

the real estate transaction at the abstract; relational arrangement between databases C.7,

L.20-27). Raveis Jr., as modified by D'Alessandro, lacks the steps of the party

confirming the at least one revision. PMBOK Guide teaches the importance of quality

planning and assurance and provides an example quality system (Fig.8-3). Quality

management techniques inherently include feedback to various parties involved with a

project, inter alia confirming revisions suggested by a reviewer, in order to continuously

improve quality. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Raveis Jr. and D'Alessandro to include the step of

confirming the at least one revision, such as suggested by PMBOK Guide, in order to

complete the quality planning and assurance process.

Regarding claim 10, Raveis Jr. as modified by D'Alessandro, includes the method

of and system for linking one report to another report (accessing vendor data based on a

particular phase of the real estate transaction at the abstract; relational arrangement

between databases C.7, L.20-27). Raveis Jr. as modified by D'Alessandro, inherently

includes computer storage timing that is commensurate with the revised or latest revision

of a stored item being saved.

13. Claims 15 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raveis

Jr. (US-6321202) and D'Alessandro (US-6556974) as applied to claims14 and 25 above, and

further in view of Morton (US-6438564).

Regarding claim 15, Raveis Jr. as modified by D'Alessandro, discloses a method

of and a system capable of linking various reports to one another (see Raveis Jr. for

discussion of accessing vendor data based on a particular phase of the real estate

transaction at the abstract; relational arrangement between databases C.7, L.20-27).

Raveis Jr. as modified by D'Alessandro, lacks method steps and system capable of

receiving a comment report from the local service provider including information related

to the summary report, and storing the comment report. Morton discloses a method of

and system capable of associating user comments with a document. Morton describes a

user commenting on a document and linking the comments to the document to develop a

complete history of the comments made by various users and how the comments relate to

the document. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Raveis Jr. and D'Alessandro to include the method and

system capable of a user commenting on the document in the form of a project summary

report, storing the comments, and linking the comments to the document, such as

suggested by Morton, in order to develop a complete record or history of comments

related to a project summary report.

14.   Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raveis Jr. (US-6321202).

Claim 27 has been interpreted as a computer system having software programmed to

generate a transaction report and to generate a local service provider summary report.

Moreover, the term "the LSP questionnaire" lacks clear antecedent basis; however, it has

been treated as any information that is input to the computer and related to a particular

local service provider.

Raveis Jr. discloses that data can be gathered, processed, and controlled (C.4,

L.27-31) and that the computer software can generate various reports (report tables and

surveys C.7, L.11-19 and C.12, L.23-25), including a transaction report (sale reports

C.13, L.61-63) and summary reports (detailed and summary reports C.13, L.60-61).

Raveis Jr. does however include software programmed to create detailed and summary

reports (C.13, L.60-63) in order to evaluate finances, agents, and contacts. Raveis Jr.

discloses that reports that can be created include, but are not limited to, listing and sale

reports, financial reports, agent reports, and contact reports (C.13, L.60-63); however,

Raveis Jr. does not specify a local service provider summary report. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the

software is programmed to generate any type of desired summary report and would

include local service provider (vendor) summary reports in addition to the types of

reports listed in the specification in order to evaluate the local service provider.

Conclusion

15.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

-   Salas (US-6230185) discloses linking comments in the form a discussion to an item

    and allowing users to vote.

-   Beizer (US-6240414) discloses a method in which users choose between conflicting

    data and mediation process for resolving conflicting data.

16.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tamara L. Graysay whose telephone number is (703) 305-1918.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tariq Hafiz, can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tg

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600